35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muta et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,448,958 (hereinafter Muta) in view of Tateyama U.S. Pat. No. 5,515,077 (hereinafter Tateyama). The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 are neither taught nor suggested by Muta nor Tateyama, alone or in combination.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, in part:

> b) an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an object to be displayed on said display screen;
> c) in response to said request, indexing a table with said flag and an object identifier to obtain a display attribute, wherein said object identifier identifies said object, and wherein *said table* is located externally of said application program and *comprises a list of said object identifiers* and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of said object identifiers

Claim 1 recites that a table comprises a list of object identifiers and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of the display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of the object identifiers. Referring to Figure 9 of the present invention, an exemplary table is illustrated with a column for object identifiers, such as, for example, button border, menu frame, menu fill, and menu foreground.

Tateyama fails to teach or suggest a table comprising a list of object identifiers and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of the display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of the object identifiers, as

claimed. In contrast, Tateyama teaches a method of rendering image data by defining image data by color vectors each composed of vector factors (Abstract). A color vector is a data unit (col. 3, lines 63-64). The color data are specified for each raster (e.g., line of a display). Thus, the color vector defines the data for one line of the display in this example. The color vector is composed of color-factors, which correspond to dots of image data one for one, in the example in col. 3, lines 62-66. Each color vector specifies the brightness and color difference of a dot (Abstract). Importantly, this method does not constitute a table with object identifiers and a plurality of associated display attribute lists, each of the display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of the object identifiers, as claimed.

The rejection cites Figure 17 of Tateyama. Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 17 and its associated text fail to teach or suggest, "a table with object identifiers and a plurality of associated display attribute lists, each of the display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of the object identifiers," as claimed. Figure 17 provides an example of how the run-length is affected by the number of colors being rendered (col. 8, lines 8-9). Tateyama provides the number of dots for each color, where the number of dots correspond to run-length for compressed data (col. 8, lines 3-5). For example, in one case, the color of the picture varies in the order blue(65), red(20), white(15), red(40), grey(20), green(20), grey(60). In another case, the color varies in the order white(65), black(20), white(15), and black(140). Using more colors, causes the run-length to shorten (col. 8, lines 8-9). Thus, Tateyama is describing how the number of colors affects the way the image data is

processed. However, Tateyama fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 in this passage or elsewhere.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim element. As is the case with Tateyama, Muta also fails to teach or suggest a "table comprising a list of object identifiers and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of the display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of the object identifiers," as claimed. Muta discloses a supporting server having an image rendering engine 321, a rendering instruction monitoring part 323, a rendering instruction storing part 327, etc. (Fig. 3). However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a table comprising a list of object identifiers and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of the display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of the object identifiers," as claimed.

For the foregoing rationale, it is respectfully asserted that independent Claim 1 overcomes the references cited of record under 35 U.S.C. §103 and is therefore allowable.

Claims 10 and 13

Claims 10 and 13 contain similar limitations as Claim 1. For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, it is respectfully asserted that independent Claims 10 and 13 overcome the references cited of record and are therefore allowable.

Claim 4

Claim 4 recites:

> The method of Claim 1, wherein one of said display attribute lists has all of its associated display attributes as being colors which are substantially different from each other, such that debugging said application program is facilitated.

Neither Muta nor Tateyama, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed limitation of the display attributes being colors that are substantially different from each other, such that debugging the application program is facilitated. Muta is able to convert a color image to multi gradations of black and white by a grey scale conversion process (Figs. 11 and 16). Muta is also able to convert an image having multi gradations of black and white to two gradations of black and white by a dithering process (Figs. 11 and 17). However, Muta fails to teach or suggest, "a display attribute list having all of its associated display attributes being colors that are substantially different from each other, such that debugging the application program is facilitated," as claimed. Tateyama fails to remedy this deficiency in Muta.

Therefore, Claim 4 is not rendered obvious by Muta in view of Tateyama. For the foregoing rationale, it is respectfully asserted that Claim 4 overcomes the references cited of record and is therefore allowable.

Claim 5

Claim 5 recites:

> The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of said application program changing at least one of the display attributes in at least one of said display attribute lists.

Neither Muta nor Tateyama, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed limitation of the application program changing at least one of the display attributes in at least one of the display attribute lists. Muta discloses that the portable

information terminal sends input information to the supporting server (Fig. 3). Figure 13 provides an example of the input information showing fields for key input, move mouse, click mouse, double click mouse, start operation, and end of operation. However, Muta fails to teach or suggest changing a display attribute in a display attribute list. Tateyama fails to remedy this deficiency in Muta.

Therefore, Claim 5 is not rendered obvious by Muta in view of Tateyama. For the foregoing rationale, it is respectfully asserted that Claim 5 overcomes the references cited of record and is therefore allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11 - 12, and 14 - 20 depend from Claims 1, 10, and 13, which are believed to be allowable. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11 - 12, and 14 - 20 has been overcome.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 3/24, 2003

Ronald M. Pomerenke
Registration No. 43,009

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile